

Serial No. : 10/686,895
Filed : October 16, 2003

REMARKS

In the final office action, the examiner rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being infinite and also under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyaki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0130906). The applicant has filed a notice of appeal mainly because the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is unreasonable.

The applicant wishes to resolve the issues of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, before filing an appeal brief so that the discussion in the appeal brief be focused on the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) issue. In the office action, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112 issue, the examiner stated that the terms "large" and "type" in the claims are not clear and suggested to delete the terms. In the amendment of December 6, 2007, the term "large structure" is changed to --particular structure--, and the term "type" is deleted or clarified to --business type--.

In the advisory action dated January 4, 2008, it is indicated that the term "particular structure" may raise new issue. Accordingly, in the amendment here, the applicant has deleted the word "particular" from the set of claims.

The applicant believes that the above amendment should be admitted under CFR 37 1.116 because (1) it complies with the requirement expressly set forth in the previous action, and (2) it presents the claims in better form for consideration on appeal. In other words, the purpose of the amendment is to focus on the issue

Serial No. : 10/686,895
Filed : October 16, 2003

regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) in the appeal by resolving the issue of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, by following the examiner's suggestion,

The applicant respectfully requests that the entry of the above amendment in the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

MURAMATSU & ASSOCIATES

Dated: 1/8/2008

By: 

Yasuo Muramatsu
Registration No. 38,684
114 Pacifica, Suite 310
Irvine, CA 92618
(949) 753-1127

AMD-AP35.007
010808